

REMARKS

The Office Action dated July 27, 2005 has been reviewed and the Examiner's comments carefully considered. Of claims 1-13 that were pending in the application, claims 10 and 11 were rejected in the Office Action. By this paper, claims 10, 11 and 13 have been amended. No claims have been canceled or added. Therefore, claims 1-13 are respectfully resubmitted for further consideration.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants note with appreciation that claims 1-9, 12 and 13 are allowed.

Specification

The Office Action objects to the specification for a minor informality. Applicants have amended the specification at page 5, line 7 to refer to "Figure 5" instead of "Figure 3." Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claim 13 is objected to for lack of antecedent basis with the phrase "the printhead scanning direction." Applicants have amended claim 13 to state "a printhead scanning direction." Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. 102(b) Rejections

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,644,345 ("Toniolo"). Claims 10 and 11 have been amended. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested for at least the following reasons.

The rejection of claim 10 should be withdrawn at least because Toniolo does not teach or suggest each and every element of the claim. For example, Toniolo fails to teach or suggest that "said servicing means is arranged to undertake said first servicing operation when said second servicing means is detached from said first servicing means and said servicing means is arranged to undertake said second servicing operation when said first servicing means and second servicing means are attached," as required by amended claim 10. Toniolo discloses a service station (30) with a cleaning part (34) and a cap (50). The blade (34) can move up or down due to rotation of a rocker (80) so that the blade (34) is in position

for cleaning. *See* Toniolo at col. 4, lines 6-15. As the head (22) continues moving, a tooth on the carriage (14) moves a lever (91), thus adjusting the position of the cap (50). *See* Toniolo at col. 4, lines 30-60. However, The blade (34) does not detach from the cap (50). Rather, the blade (34) is connected to the cap (50) via the rocker (80).

Assuming arguendo that the trough (36) and thus the blade (34) can be detached from the rocker (80), such as, for example, in cleaning, there is no disclosure in Toniolo that the servicing operations will continue if parts are detached. Thus, if the trough (36) and blade (34) are detached, the cap (50) would not continue its servicing operation. On the contrary, the entire service station (30) would likely not work while portions are detached. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 11 includes recitations similar to claim 10. For example, amended claim 11 states that “the service station is arranged to undertake a first servicing operation when at least one of the modules is detached and a second servicing operation when the modules are attached,” which is not taught or suggested by Toniolo. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Conclusion

For the aforementioned reasons, claims 1-13 are now in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date October 4, 2005

By Jessica Palmer

Jessica Palmer
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 56,986
Telephone: (202) 295-4776
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399